

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

M.B.,	:	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
ROOSEVELT INN LLC <i>et al.</i> ,	:	No. 21-2984
<i>Defendants</i>	:	

K.R.,	:	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
ROOSEVELT INN LLC <i>et al.</i> ,	:	No. 21-3218
<i>Defendants</i>	:	

C.A.,	:	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
ROOSEVELT INN LLC <i>et al.</i> ,	:	No. 21-3222
<i>Defendants</i>	:	

B.H.,	:	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
ROOSEVELT INN LLC <i>et al.</i> ,	:	No. 21-3225
<i>Defendants</i>	:	

A.H.,	:	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
ROOSEVELT INN LLC <i>et al.</i> ,	:	No. 21-3277
<i>Defendants</i>	:	

C.A.,	:	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
WYNDHAM WORLDWIDE	:	
CORPORATION <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
<i>Defendants</i>	:	No. 21-3392

B.H.,	:	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
WYNDHAM WORLDWIDE	:	
CORPORATION <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
<i>Defendants</i>	:	No. 21-3396

K.R.,	:	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
WYNDHAM WORLDWIDE	:	
CORPORATION <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
<i>Defendants</i>	:	No. 21-3401

A.H.,	:	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
WYNDHAM WORLDWIDE	:	
CORPORATION <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
<i>Defendants</i>	:	No. 21-3430

A.H.,	:	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
ROOSEVELT INN LLC <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
<i>Defendants</i>	:	No. 21-3914

ORDER

AND NOW, this 24th day of October, 2021, upon consideration of M.B.'s Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 15, Civ. Action No. 21-2984), Roosevelt Inn LLC, Roosevelt Motor Inn Inc., UFVS Management Company, LLC, and Yagna Patel's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 17, Civil Action No. 21-2984), and Alpha-Centurion Security, Inc.'s Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 18, Civil Action No. 21-2984);

K.R.'s Motions to Remand (Doc. No. 6, Civ. Action No. 21-3218, and Doc. No. 7, Civ. Action No. 21-3401), Roosevelt Inn LLC, Roosevelt Motor Inn Inc., and UFVS Management Company, LLC's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 9, Civ. Action No. 21-3218), Wyndham Worldwide Corporation (n/k/a Travel + Leisure Co.), Wyndham Hotel Group, LLC, Wyndham Hotels and Resorts, Inc., Wyndham Hotel Management, Inc., Wyndham Hotel and Resorts, LLC, and Days Inns Worldwide, Inc.'s Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 10, Civ. Action. No. 21-3401), 4200 Roosevelt LLC and 4200 Rose Hospitality LLC d/b/a Days Inn's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 12, Civ. Action No. 21-3401), and Alpha-Centurion Security Inc's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 15, Civ. Action No. 21-3401);

C.A.'s Motions to Remand (Doc. No. 6, Civ. Action No. 21-3222, and Doc. No. 8, Civ. Action No. 21-3392), Roosevelt Inn LLC, Roosevelt Motor Inn Inc., and UFVS Management Company, LLC's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 8, Civ. Action No. 21-3222); Wyndham Worldwide Corporation (n/k/a Travel + Leisure Co.), Wyndham Hotel Group, LLC, Wyndham Hotels and Resorts, Inc., Wyndham Hotel Management, Inc., Wyndham Hotel and Resorts, LLC, and Days Inns Worldwide, Inc.'s Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No.

14, Civ. Action No. 21-3392), Ritz Hotel Group's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 15, Civ. Action No. 21-3392), Ramara, Inc.'s Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 17, Civ. Action No. 21-3392), Ashoka Investment & Management Services' Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. Nos. 19–20, Civ. Action No. 21-3392), and 4200 Roosevelt LLC and 4200 Rose Hospitality LLC d/b/a Days Inn's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 22, Civ. Action No. 21-3392),

B.H.'s Motions to Remand (Doc. No. 6, Civ. Action No. 21-3225, and Doc. No. 8, Civ. Action No. 21-3396), Roosevelt Inn LLC, Roosevelt Motor Inn Inc., and UFVS Management Company, LLC's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 9, Civ. Action No. 21-3225), Wyndham Hotel Group, LLC, Wyndham Hotels and Resorts, Inc., Wyndham Hotel Management, Inc., Wyndham Hotel and Resorts, LLC, and Days Inns Worldwide, Inc.'s Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 11, Civ. Action No. 21-3396), Ritz Hotel Group's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 12, Civ. Action No. 21-3396), Ramara, Inc.'s Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 14, Civ. Action No. 21-3396), 4200 Roosevelt LLC and 4200 Rose Hospitality LLC d/b/a Days Inn's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 16, Civ. Action No. 21-3396), and Alpha-Centurion Security Inc's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 19, Civ. Action No. 21-3396);

A.H.'s Motions to Remand (Doc. Nos. 4, 12, Civ. Action No. 21-3277, Doc. No. 9, Civ. Action No. 21-3430, and Doc. No. 32, Civ. Action No. 21-2984), Roosevelt Inn LLC, Roosevelt Motor Inn Inc., UFVS Management Company, LLC, and Yagna Patel's Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 6, Civil Action No. 21-3277), Wyndham Hotel Management, Inc., Wyndham Hotel and Resorts, LLC, Wyndham Worldwide Corporation (n/k/a Travel + Leisure Co.), Wyndham Hotel Group, LLC, and Wyndham Hotels and Resorts, Inc.'s Opposition to the Motion

to Remand (Doc. No. 29, Civ. Action No. 21-2984, and Doc. No. 17, Civ. Action No. 21-3277), and Eighty Eight, L.P.'s Oppositions to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 18, Civ. Action No. 21-2377, and Doc. No. 36, Civ. Action No. 21-2984);

A.H.'s Motion to Perfect *Nunc Pro Tunc* (Doc. No. 35, Civ. Action No. 21-2984) and Eighty Eight's Opposition to the Motion to Perfect (Doc. No. 40, Civ. Action No. 21-2984);

Wyndham Hotel Management, Inc., Wyndham Hotel and Resorts, LLC, Wyndham Worldwide Corporation (n/k/a Travel + Leisure Co.), Wyndham Hotel Group, LLC, and Wyndham Hotels and Resorts, Inc.'s Supplement in Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 41, Civ. Action No. 21-2984), 4200 Roosevelt LLC and 4200 Rose Hospitality LLC d/b/a Days Inn's Supplement in Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 42, Civ. Action No. 21-2984), Roosevelt Inn LLC, Roosevelt Motor Inn Inc., UFVS Management Company, LLC, and Yagna Patel's Supplement in Opposition to the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 43, Civ. Action No. 21-2984), M.B., C.A., B.H., and K.R.'s Supplement in Support of the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 44, Civ. Action No. 21-2984), and A.H.'s Supplement in Support of the Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 45, Civ. Action No. 21-2984); the oral argument held on September 29, 2021; and for the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum, it is **ORDERED** that:

1. M.B.'s Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 15, Civ. Action No. 21-2984) is **GRANTED**.
2. K.R.'s Motions to Remand (Doc. No. 6, Civ. Action No. 21-3218, and Doc. No. 7, Civ. Action No. 21-3401) are **GRANTED**.
3. C.A.'s Motions to Remand (Doc. No. 6, Civ. Action No. 21-3222, and Doc. No. 8, Civ. Action No. 21-3392) are **GRANTED**.
4. B.H.'s Motions to Remand (Doc. No. 6, Civ. Action No. 21-3225, and Doc. No. 8, Civ. Action No. 21-3396) are **GRANTED**.


5. A.H.'s Motion to Perfect Nunc Pro Tunc (Doc. No. 35, Civ. Action No. 21-2984) is **GRANTED**. Her Motion to Remand in Civ. Action No. 21-3430 (Doc. No. 9, Civ. Action No. 21-3430) is **DEEMED** timely filed.

6. A.H.'s Motions to Remand (Doc. Nos. 4, 12, Civ. Action No. 21-3277, Doc. No. 9, Civ. Action No. 21-3430, and Doc. No. 32, Civ. Action No. 21-2984) are **GRANTED**.

7. These cases are **REMANDED** to the Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania Court of Common Pleas.

8. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** these cases for all purposes, including statistics.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gene E.K. Pratter", is written over a horizontal line.

GENE E.K. PRATTER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE